

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Allanna Warren,
Plaintiff(s),
vs.
Pentagon Federal Credit Union,
Defendant(s)

2:23-cv-02007-JAD-MDC

Order

Pending before the Court is plaintiff's *Motion to Extend Time to Reply* (ECF No. 67). Plaintiff requests additional time to reply to defendant's Response (ECF No. 65) to her *Motion for Sanctions* (ECF No. 57) and *Motions for Charges of Perjury* (ECF No. 58). The Court ordered plaintiff's *Motion for Sanctions* (ECF No. 57) and *Motion for Charges of Perjury* (ECF No. 58) to be struck from the docket. ECF No. 66. Defendant filed their Response (ECF No. 65) to the Motions while the Court's Order (ECF No. 66) was drafted but before it had been filed. Since the Motions (ECF No. 57 and 58) at issue were struck from the docket, defendant's Response (ECF No. 65) is moot. Therefore, the Court strikes defendant's Response (ECF No. 65) and plaintiff's *Motion to Extend Time to Reply* (ECF No. 67) pursuant to its powers to control the docket. The district courts have inherent authority to control their dockets and to "achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases." *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 43, 111 S. Ct. 2123, 115 L. Ed. 2d 27 (1991).

ACCORDINGLY.

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Response to Motions (ECF No. 65) and the *Motion to Extend Time to Reply* (ECF No. 67) be stricken.
2. Plaintiff shall not file any further Motions or documents until the Court:
 - a. grants her IFP application **or** she pays the full filing fee; **AND**

b. her Complaint is screened and accepted.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Local Rules IB 3-1 and IB 3-2, a party may object to orders and reports and recommendations issued by the magistrate judge. Objections must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen days. LR IB 3-1, 3-2. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985).

This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Pursuant to LR IA 3-1, the plaintiff must immediately file written notification with the court of any change of address. The notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party's attorney, or upon the opposing party if the party is unrepresented by counsel. Failure to comply with this rule may result in dismissal of the action.

DATED this 19th day of April 2024.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Hon. Maximiliano D. Couvillier III
United States Magistrate Judge